

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace sheets 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 14-16 with those similarly numbered and included herewith.

#### REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Office Action mailed December 7, 2004.

The Office Action first reports that the Declaration was defective because of the filing date of the provisional application provided on the Declaration filed on January 9, 2002 was incorrect. As discussed with Examiner Scuderi on March 15, 2005 it is respectfully submitted that a new Declaration is not needed due to the proper claim already provided in the application. In particular, when the application was filed on September 20, 2001 a priority claim to the U.S. provisional patent application by its correct serial number and filing date was made by the undersigned. In addition, on August 30, 2002 the undersigned filed a Request for a Corrected Filing Receipt in which the priority claim was restated. As requested by Examiner Scuderi, a copy of the Request for a Corrected Filing Receipt is enclosed herewith. In view of the foregoing, it is believed that a new Declaration is not needed. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to for a number of informalities. The following corrections have been made in replacement sheets submitted herewith:

FIGS. 4 and 7 have been amended to include "Prior Art" legends;

FIG. 1 has been amended to include a reference number 30;

FIG. 5 has been amended to include reference number 211; (In addition, a double arrow has been indicated between internet 205 and server 204. This double arrow was

inadvertently omitted. Support for this drawing correction is found in the Specification on page 14, lines 8-11 wherein it is stated that the server 204 is connected and separately addressable through network 205.);

FIG. 12 has been amended to include reference number 301;

FIG. 14 has been amended to include reference number 305;

FIG. 2 has been amended to correct reference number 36 as 84; and

FIGS. 12, 13 and 14 have been amended with the labels "Automatic Mode", "Single Mode", and "Multiple Mode", respectively.

With respect to the objection to the figures for not showing "do\_field", "g\_card\_types", "g\_card\_num" and "g\_expiry\_date", applicant has amended the specification to correct these inadvertent errors where "p\_card\_types", "p\_card\_num" and "p\_expiry\_date" should have been used, respectively. These labels and "do\_field" are shown in FIGS. 10A and 10B for instance in FIG. 10B in lines 4-9 thereof. With correction of the specification, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Office Action next reports that the Specification was objected to on page 24, lines 24-25 where "'onNoReco' attribute 303" should read "'onReco' attribute 303". Applicant agrees and an appropriate correction has been made.

The Office Action next reports that claim 24 was objected to for an informality. Applicant has corrected the cited informality.

Claims 1, 2, 9, 13, 14, 20, 35 and 36 were next objected to as being indefinite. Claims 1, 35 and 36 were cited as

lacking insufficient antecedent basis for "the user". Applicant has amended claim 1 to provide proper antecedent basis; however, the antecedent basis for this language in claim 36 is found in independent claim 34. Claim 35 has been cancelled.

Claims 9 and 20 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for elements recited therein. Claim 14 is believed proper in view of the amendment to claim 1. Claims 2 and 13 have been cancelled. However, the features recited in claim 13 have been included in claim 1 with appropriate correction of "contents" to "information".

The Office Action reports that claims 12 and 13 were rejected as being obvious over Barclay (U.S. 5,960,399) in view of Berstis (U.S. 6,718,015). (It is respectfully noted that the Office Action cited the patent number of Wesemann et al., U.S. 6,349,132, with respect to Berstis; however the specific reasoning used in the rejection follows Berstis rather than Wesemann et al.)

Barclay is cited for disclosing a server/client system for processing speech data comprising a web server, a client device and a recognition server, but it is acknowledged that Barclay does not disclose a second client device configured to record speech data and adapted to send speech data to the recognition server. Berstis is cited for disclosing such a device (claim 12) and in particular a telephone (claim 13).

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the cited combination of Barclay and Berstis teach the invention recited by claims 1, 12 and 13, now presented as amended claim 1. Berstis teaches a telephone server 17 adapted to receive input from a user using a telephone 15 in order to access and render websites from a server 12. (Column 3, line

49 - Column 4, line 13). The telephone server 17 includes a voice recognizer 21 for performing speech recognition from the user and a text-to-speech synthesizer 25 used to render the website audibly to the user through the telephone 15. It is important to understand that voice recognition as taught by Berstis is implemented by the telephone server 17, which also performs the rendering (i.e. audibly) to the user.

Claim 1 has been amended to patentably distinguish the present invention as recited by this claim from the combination of Barclay and Berstis. In particular, claim 1 recites a network including a web server having information accessible remotely; a first and second client device adapted to receive information from the web server and having a rendering device to indicate fields to be entered. Each client device is configured to record input data associated with each of the fields upon an indication by a user of which field subsequent input is intended for, and wherein each client device is adapted to send the input data to a remote location. However, the second client device comprises a telephone and a voice browser capable of rendering the information from the web server. Finally, a recognition server is configured to receive the input data from either of the client devices and return data indicative of what was recognized to at least one of the client devices and the web server.

The combination of Barclay and Berstis simply do not disclose such a system. Barclay fails to disclose a second client device and Berstis discloses a telephone server but the telephone server functions to render websites audibly and is not configured to work with a remote recognition server as recited by claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, amended claim 1 is believed allowable. Dependent claims 8, 9 and 14-25 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are believed separately patentable. For instance, dependent claims 16 and 21-24 recite features that further allow the system to accommodate different types of client devices in an efficient and consistent manner that is also not taught or suggested by Barclay or Berstis.

For the reasons discussed with respect to amended claim 1, claim 34, which recites a method for processing voice recognition in a client/server system, is believed allowable, while dependent claims 36-39 are believed separately patentable.

Claim 26 recites a server/client system for processing data, including a web server, a client device comprising a telephone with a speaker. However, unlike Berstis claim 26 further recites a recognition server remote from the web server and the client device configured to receive the input data and an indication of the grammar. The recognition server is adapted to return data indicative of what was inputted to at least one of the client and the web server. Claim 26 was rejected as being unpatentable over Barclay in view of Jochumson (U.S. 6,453,290). However, neither Barclay nor Jochumson teach or suggest a telephone as used in such a server/client system.

An extension of time is hereby requested for consideration of this Amendment. A charge authorization is included herewith for the extension of time fee.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Steven M. Koehler, Reg. No. 36,188  
Suite 1400 - International Centre  
900 Second Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

SMK:dkm